

Date: Sun, 9 May 93 04:30:20 PDT
From: Info-Hams Mailing List and Newsgroup <info-hams@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Info-Hams-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Info-Hams Digest V93 #559
To: Info-Hams

Info-Hams Digest Sun, 9 May 93 Volume 93 : Issue 559

Today's Topics:

FCC Rules on Transmission
FM Transmission of music.(Pirate stations)
GMRS Users?
Kenwood 741 Out of Band Problem
m Amp - How??
Need manual/schematic for RME70
no-code defense
RACES Bulletin #273
RF "remote control" low power transmitters in the 70cm ham band!
What am I hearing at 137.5?
Why is .info stuff here?
Zed in callsign:what is it, where come from?

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Info-Hams-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Info-Hams Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/info-hams".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Wed, 5 May 1993 02:43:29 GMT
From: sdd.hp.com!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!darwin.sura.net!knuth.mtsu.edu!raider!
theporch!jackatak!jackhill@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: FCC Rules on Transmission
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

dadams@cray.com (David Adams) writes:

> In article 172287@locus.com, dana@lando.la.locus.com (Dana H. Myers) writes:
> |I believe a licensed amateur may operate a remote-control transmitter
> |in a model craft at power levels not to exceed 1W without regularly
> |identifying, but a license is still required.

>
> But then even non licenced hobbists can use remote controled model
> airplanes, boats, cars etc. How are they able to do this? What
> frequencies do they use. (I suppose they are not allowed to build
> their own transmitters, and that that is probably one of the differences.)
And, the frequency allocations are not so pleasant for the hobbyist
(non-ham) either: the "holes" between 10khz steps in the CB band plan
is one MAJOR source of remote control frequencies, and the others are
in part 15 ranges -- like 49 Mhz...

73

```
+-----+  
| Jack GF Hill          |Voice: (615) 459-2636 - Bicycling and SCUBA Diving |  
| P. O. Box 1685        |Modem: (615) 377-5980 - Compu$erve 76427,31 |  
| Brentwood, TN 37024 |jackhill@jackatak.raider.net - Ham Call: W4PPT |  
+-----+
```

Date: Sun, 9 May 1993 01:04:08 GMT
From: tarpit!tous!jwt!ksj@uunet.uu.net
Subject: FM Transmission of music.(Pirate stations)
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

gary@ke4zv.uucp (Gary Coffman) writes:
> I wonder, are FCC vans amphibious? I think they'd have to be to get
> to the UK.

Ah. Wasn't aware that the UK had no laws against pirate radio. Thanks
for the information.

> Get a clue, he's not in the US. No doubt he'd be in violation of all
> kinds of UK regulations, but let the UK folks deal with it.

My post was intended to advise someone against doing something that's
almost surely illegal, thus saving him a lot of embarrasment and perhaps
a lot of legal trouble. It was not an invitation for smart-ass flammers
to show how much more observant they are. Also, I don't think the fact
that someone's in another country makes him unworthy of a little advice.

Scott

Date: 9 May 1993 04:28:57 GMT
From: sdd.hp.com!col.hp.com!bobw@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: GMRS Users?

To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

hi

check out a book called encyclopedia of electronic circuits vol. 1
by rudolph graf. It has a few schematics for 2m amps..not as much
power as you were looking for but they'll run off 12.5 vdc and you
can build them for next to nothing....

Later on..

DEAN

Date: Sun, 9 May 1993 01:23:32 GMT

From: pa.dec.com!decabo.abo.dec.com!anarky.enet.dec.com!brewer@decwrl.dec.com

Subject: Need manual/schematic for RME70

To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

I am restoring a RME 70 receiver and could really
use a copy of the schematics. Anyone have one, or
tales, anecdotal or not, of this radio? I have the
chassis cleaned of most of the dirt, and all of the
living things, and am heading toward smoke test time.

Thanks for any help!

/john wb5oau

| John Brewer | Internet: brewer@anarky.enet.dec.com |
| wb5oau | Packet | wb5oau@wb2ars |

Date: Thu, 6 May 1993 14:09:10 GMT

From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!darwin.sura.net!knuth.mtsu.edu!raider!theporch!
jackatak!jackhill@network.UCSD.EDU

Subject: no-code defense

To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

system@mooch.sbs.com (Christopher Ogren) writes:

> N1MNF/AA <levin@bbn.com> writes:

> > Are you saying that the '"no-code" bashers' are a majority of hams?

> > Puh-leeze.

>

> Well I would say that they are a majority of hams who have been licensed

> for more than a few years.

NOT! I have been licensed long enough to remember having to draw

schematics on the test! I support a no-code entry license. It has brought some fine people into the hobby and has provided many of them with enough exposure that they want (60% of them actually DO it!) to upgrade and expand their "Ham Radio Horizons". Without this recent increase in hams, all buying new equipment and asking questions and trying to learn (from the closed minds like we hear on this 'Net?) we are growing again. We have a reason to expect a continued flow of new equipment and new issues to be resolved on the air. There have been disputes over EVERY change I have witnessed in my 37 years with a ticket. Every change was met with Nay-sayers who predicted the dire consequences of gloom and doom. Yes, the incentive mess of '68 DID nearly wreck Amateur Radio in this country...but we survived. Now we have a great influx, for the first time in 25 years, so step aside and help elmer these new comers. They will keep the hobby strong, and they *want* to learn...if you could turn off the flame-throwers long enough to teach them... And, you might even *learn* something from them (I do, in every class I teach) *if* you can shut your mouths long enough to let your ears take over... The "no-clues" I hear running DX hand-holding nets and speech processors splattering up the bands all have callsigns from 1r years or so ago...not the new-comers!

> The no-clues (oops I mean no-codes) have increased disproportionately
> to other licenses. It figures though.
Yes, it does, but NOT for the reasons you cite. What it shows is that there were a huge group of people with enough willingness to study -- even rote memorization of the pool takes some mental energy -- to gain entry, and that 60% go on to upgrade shows they came to stay and they came to play. Lighten up and help out.... or shut up and get out of the way... Sheesh!

> Two meters sounds something reminiscent of CB around here.
Finally it spread to RI, huh? Been like that in major metro areas for years. If *you* had really been around as long as you'd like people to think, you'd already know how vacuuous and leaky your argument is.

> It is not necessarily the code requirement that bothers me. It is the
> joke of a test which is administered.
This point, I'll give you. The written test *is* easy. Someone suggested not long ago that people wanting tickets be brought into a room with soldering stations and basic metering available..with a parts bin, and when they managed a QSO, under VE supervision of course, they could get a ticket...Then, to get an extra, you have to do ATV or something hard...CW would get you a novice with full HF CW privileges; FM would get a technician, with full VHF/UHF; SSB would gain a general, but would ONLY allow HF SSB; SSB/CW/AM/FM would qualify for an advanced and give those modes in HF/VHF/UHF...and for the extra, building the ATV would permit any and all modes (no more of the part 97 restrictions on mode so we could *really* experiment) on

all bands, consistent with frequency allocations and International Agreements... *THEN* we'd see how many of those fancy new call signs would be left when the dust settled! ;^)

Geez, guys. This is progress. It ain't perfect, but it *is* what we have, and we need to make the best of it, rather than grouching about it... Get a Life! ;^)

73

```
+-----+
| Jack GF Hill      |Voice: (615) 459-2636 - Bicycling and SCUBA Diving |
| P. O. Box 1685    |Modem: (615) 377-5980 - Compu$erve 76427,31 |
| Brentwood, TN 37024|jackhill@jackatak.raider.net - Ham Call: W4PPT |
+-----+
```

Date: 9 May 93 04:28:40 GMT
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu
Subject: RACES Bulletin #273
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Bid: \$RACESBUL.273

TO: ALL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCIES VIA AMATEUR RADIO
INFO: ALL RACES OPERATORS IN CA (ALLCA: OFFICIAL)
ALL AMATEURS U.S. (@ USA: INFORMATION)
FROM: CA STATE OFFICE OF EMERGENCY SERVICES (W6HIR @ WA6NWE.CA)
2800 Meadowview Rd., Sacramento, CA 95832 (916)262-1600
Landline BBS open to all: (916) 262-1657

RACESBUL.273 DATE: May 10, 1993
SUBJECT: MGT - The committed volunteer - Part 2/3

Just as there are three communications service areas -- administrative, operational, and technical -- there are also varying degrees of activity from one volunteer to the next.

Some people are required to perform on what we will call a CONSTANT basis. A RACES Radio Officer, a CAP communications officer, or a volunteer CD communications officer puts in a lot of yime. He or she does their work at your office, at home, and at their own office. It is not at all unusual for these administrative volunteers to put in 16-30 hours a week.

These same people plus another type of volunteer serve on a SCHEDULED basis. These are the people who are required to serve at a specific time and place on a repetitive and scheduled basis. This might be for weekly radio schedules, paper work at headquarters, training, and other frequently scheduled activities.

(To be concluded in Part 3)
EOM

Date: Sun, 09 May 1993 05:20:25 GMT
From: nwnexus!ole!ssc!markz@uunet.uu.net
Subject: RF "remote control" low power transmitters in the 70cm ham band!
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Robert Casey (wa2ise@netcom.com) wrote:
: On page 55 of the May 93 _RF Design_ magazine, there is a product announce-
: ment for a small transmitter device for remote control applications.
: Operates on 433.92MHz That's in the ham band! Near/in the ATV area?
: Company name is RF Monolithics, Inc, no address given, just an Info card
: number.

In the USA, this appears to be under Part 15.231. All sorts of fine print, but the gist of it seems that a low power short duration signal can be sent on just about any frequency above 70 MHz (except those on the forbidden list, 15.205). There are two categories of service with different allowed field strengths, depending on how much of the time the signal is transmitted.

Manually initiated signals used for remote control can send 1250 microvolts per meter at 3 meters at 130 Mhz up to 12,500 microvolts/meter at 3 meters on 470 MHz. (Grossly simplified, there is a chart on the actual limits.) Transmissions are limited to 5 seconds.

Automatic transmissions with a duty cycle of less than 1/30th, a transmission length of 1 second or less and, an off period of at least 10 seconds can use 40 percent of the previous levels. (Another chart for this class.)

(Gee, I'd not read this section before. That's pretty obnoxious. About as much as a cordless phone is allowed.)

Mark Zenier markz@ssc.wa.com markz@ssc.com

Date: Sat, 8 May 1993 23:42:34 GMT
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!ira.uka.de!sol.ctr.columbia.edu!news.kei.com!news.oc.com!csci-wiermac.etsu.edu!user@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: What am I hearing at 137.5?
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

I just recently bought a RS 2006 (due to the "scare" - but I was going to buy one anyway :-)

I'm hearing something that REALLY sounds like cordless phones in the range of 137.3 to 137.5. I scanned the actual frequencies but couldn't locate a duplicate signal. Since I don't have good technical specs on the 2006 yet, I wonder if these might be 3rd harmonics of 49 Mhz cordless (+/- some if freq?).

This isn't too farfetched since I live in an apartment complex so well might have several cordless units within a couple of hundred feet...

THANKS!

===== insert usual disclaimers here =====

Bob Wier, East Texas State U., Commerce, Texas
wier@merlin.etsu.edu (watch for address change)

Date: Fri, 7 May 1993 22:11:52 GMT
From: usc!sdd.hp.com!hpscit.sc.hp.com!hplextra!hpfcso!hplvec!
scott@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Why is .info stuff here?
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In rec.radio.amateur.misc, pschleck@cwis.unomaha.edu (Paul W Schleck KD3FU) writes:

> Most major newsreaders (tin, rn, xrn, nn, anonnews) will present
> a cross-posted article only once, in the first newsgroup on the
> cross-posting line that you read, making cross-posting transparent.

... stuff deleted

> I'm surprised that there is still confusion over this issue,
> particularly among those who have been on the net a while.

"Most major newsreaders." With that phrase, I continue to see the problems experienced by users of newsreaders that *don't* deal gracefully with xposting completely discounted.

Yet every time something like this comes up, lots of folks complain about excessive xposting.

The bottom line is that "Most major newsreaders" aside, a lot of *READERS* (you know, the humans who use these services) are troubled by excessive xposting. I'm stuck learning to live with xposting, but good grief! A newsgroup intended as a target for xposting!? That's just too much! I wish people would recognize the simple fact that for many of the *users* of the net, (who *cares* about the newsreaders) have problems with xposting. Would you at least recognize that this is a real problem for many folks.

To quote Paul, I'm surprised that there is still confusion over this issue, particularly among those who have been on the net a while.

BTW, I use a UN*X based newsreader, used by a large portion of Hewlett-Packard. It knows nothing of xposting. Many HP sites are moving to tin, but many (including mine) currently are not. I have no choice in newsreaders. Many other users are in similar positions.

Sorry for the tone of this posting, but it's a topic of some frustration. And please, at the very least, respect the fact that xposting causes many of us problems, even if you intend to ignore those problems.

Scott Turner N0VRF scott@hplsl.LVLD.HP.COM
HP VXi Systems Division

Date: Wed, 5 May 1993 02:47:02 GMT
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!darwin.sura.net!
knuth.mtsu.edu!raider!theporch!jackatak!jackhill@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Zed in callsign: what is it, where come from?
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

easu348@orion.oac.uci.edu (Andrew Schwartz Parker) writes:
> I'm a new HAM, and I have one maybe stupid question that the FAQ does not beg
> to cover. Here in California (hopefully elsewhere) HAMS with a "Z" in their
> callsign sometimes say the (word?) "zed" instead of just plain "Z".

Nope, that is not a stupid question. In fact, the way you ask, it is a good one...

As you have probably noticed, the use of phonetics in voice facilitates understanding, especially when letters with similar sound when pronounced are spoken: B, C, D, E, G, P, T, V, Z... In "normal" conversation, rather than slip into phonetics ("CHARLEY CHARLEY ZULU") C C ZED works pretty well. The "zed" is the French pronunciation of

the letter "Z" (they say zed all the time when they encounter a "z(ed)")
And, that is worldwide, not just California.

And, welcome to hamdom. Glad you got to the exam and joined us...
73 ES HPE CU ON BANDS

```
+-----+
| Jack GF Hill      |Voice: (615) 459-2636 - Bicycling and SCUBA Diving |
| P. O. Box 1685    |Modem: (615) 377-5980 - Compu$erve 76427,31 |
| Brentwood, TN 37024|jackhill@jackatak.raider.net - Ham Call: W4PPT |
+-----+
```

Date: Thu, 6 May 1993 16:10:41 GMT
From: valinor.mythical.com!n5ial!jim@uunet.uu.net
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <C6Fp4o.F2L@news.Hawaii.Edu>, <easu348.736406456@orion.oac.uci.edu>,
<930503.231753.903.rusnews.w165w@mooch.sbs.com>
Subject : Re: what is the issue here? (WAS: no-code defense)

In article <930503.231753.903.rusnews.w165w@mooch.sbs.com>
system@mooch.sbs.com (Christopher Ogren) writes:

>I would like to see a
>poll, pertaining to no-code approval, of amateurs who were licensed
>BEFORE the no-code's inception. You might be surprised that it is not a
>majority of those hams who favored the no-code license.

it seems to me that there are two issues being discussed (and flamed about)
here, not one.

first, there is the question of whether or not people feel that the no-code
license should have been created. I never really had an opinion either way
(good or bad) on this issue, and frankly, still don't. I know a lot of
people who were opposed to it, and a lot who weren't. of course, none of
this really matters anymore, as the license class exists, and we can sit
here and argue back and forth until our fingers drop off, but it's all a
waste of time and bandwidth.

the second issue is how people treat these new amateur radio ops who came
in under the no-code license, now that it exists. all of the folks I know
who were opposed to the creation of this license welcome the new hams, and
are happy to offer their help (not insults...real help) to bring the new
folks up to speed, just as has always been done in amateur radio (i.e.,
they don't let their dislike for the license itself influence the way that
they treat the people who hold that licens). of course, it would seem that

there are some folks here who insist on venting their distaste for the new license on the new hams.

now, whether the majority of hams were in favor of or opposed to the no-code license is, to me, unimportant, as it is a done deal. the license exists. a vote, even if overwhelmingly against, isn't going to do much. the important thing is whether or not the majority of hams treats the new hams (those who got in under the no-code license) like amateur radio operators. I believe, from what I've seen, that a strong majority of hams treat these folks just like any other new ham, which is as it should be.

just my \$ 0.10 worth....

--jim

PS: FWIW, I was a general before no-code existed....

--

#include <std_disclaimer.h>

73 DE N5IAL (/4)

INTERNET: jim@n5ial.mythical.com | j.graham@ieee.org ICBM: 30.23N 86.32W
AMATEUR RADIO: n5ial@w4zbb (Ft. Walton Beach, FL) AMTOR SELCAL: NIAL

E-mail me for information about KAMterm (host mode for Kantronics TNCs).

End of Info-Hams Digest V93 #559
